

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
Submitted electronically to the U.S. Patent and
Trademark Office on: September 8, 2006
(Date of Transmission)

FRANK C. NICHOLAS (33,983)
Name of applicant, assignee or registered representative

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS/
Signature

September 8, 2006
Date of Signature

PATENT
Case No. 7780/17
(T00343)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re patent application of:)	
)	
WEIJING CHEN ET AL.)	Examiner: PEACHES, RANDY
)	
Serial No.: 09/932,842)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2686
Filed: AUGUST 17, 2001)	
)	
Title: PUBLIC WIRELESS LOCAL)	
AREA NETWORK)	

REPLY BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22202-1450

Dear Sir:

Please consider Appellants' Reply brief as follows:

In the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner continues to mistake the disclosures of the Lemieux reference and mistake the legal standards applicable to an anticipation rejection.

It is well settled that a claim is anticipated *only* if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Thus, to warrant the §102(e) rejection, the references cited by the Examiner must show each and every limitation of the claims *in as complete detail as claimed*.

However, Lemieux simply does not disclose that the devices are public telephones, as claimed in claims 1, 10, and 16. At most, Lemieux discloses:

Each of the distribution channels is terminated with a network termination (NT) node or module that is provided at a user's (or subscriber's) home, office, business, or any other facility. For example, three NT modules 226A-226C are shown in this FIG. Also, for purposes of illustration, the NT module 226A is provided at a subscriber's facility 228 which includes three devices, D1 (reference numeral 230A), D2 (reference numeral 230B), and D3 (reference numeral 230C), each requiring a portion of the bandwidth provided by the distribution channel 224A.

Lemieux '942 at column 4, lines 23-31.

Lemieux does not disclose that devices D1-D3 are public telephones, and at most discloses that the devices terminate "at a user's (or subscriber's) home, office, business, or any other facility" the devices are not public telephones. In fact, by disclosing that the termination is at a "user's (or subscriber's)" property, Lemieux unequivocally teaches away from the device being a *public* telephone as claimed. Those of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize at least one difference between a termination at property controlled by a user or subscriber, and a public telephone. Therefore, this anticipation rejection must fall.

The remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 10, or 16. All of the claims are therefore patentable.

SUMMARY

The Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-20 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: **September 8, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,
Weijing Chen, et al

/FRANK C. NICHOLAS/

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113

Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicants